

Trial of the Bishop of New York

Bishop Ives left New York on Friday 26th, the day until which Bishop Elliott (with whom it was now understood Bishops Meade and Otey were to visit for the expected large addition of affidavits. On the 26th, Bishop Ives received a letter from Bishop Ives, dated in Philadelphia on the 26th. The promised new affidavits had not arrived. Bishop Ives had asked Bishop Elliott if he would be willing to be a presenter. That must depend, he said, upon evidence yet to be produced. He would be glad to see the additional affidavit used for the presentation.

On Wednesday, October 30th, the Bishops met in the General Theological Seminary, New York.

*At this time two of my presbyters called on the presenting Bishops, and remonstrated with them on the shortness of the time allowed. They offered another day. It is evident, that they were not so much desirous to make up for past errors, as to defend an incompetent and unqualified person. I allowed time to answer the purpose originally designed by my request and Bishop Elliott's promise—seeing that my past ignorance of the particular charges had allowed me to be misled by the character of the person, and that the character of the procedure was not thus materially altered.

ble, and to strengthen prejudice against me. What but this last desire could have induced them to frame the ninth article! This specifies nothing, it merely charges sundry acts of impropriety during the space of the last seven years. Now, I am sure that the constitution by which it was thrown out by the court, was its bounden duty, and an act of mere justice. None appreciating the righteous dealing which should characterize actions of this kind, will, I apprehend, justify such a charge. Will any doubt that it could have been seen to have no other bearing than to strengthen prejudice against the accused in the minds of his judges?

* It has been rumored that in my address to the court, between conviction and sentence, I admitted the truth of the charges. The readers of that document will, I think, see that this was not the case. I said that it ought to have been framed on the supposition of the sufficiency of the evidence for the verdict which had been found. This is the amount of the alleged admission. There will also be the charge in the indictment that the conspiracy into the evidence was only waived, not abandoned.

his wife. He swears to it, in his affidavit, as a fact communicated to him by his wife at the first stopping place on our journey. Having been asked by his wife that this was not so, for the circumstance sworn to had never occurred, he swears in court that the mistake arose from something his wife said to him in the carriage. She swears that she never said any thing to him of the kind; but that he must have derived his mistaken idea from some gesture of hers, designed to illustrate another statement.

The published evidence will show other incongruities also between the oaths of this clergyman and his wife.

He hopes that I do not suffer them—to pass unheeded.

It has pleased my Maker to give me—friends and—should I unite to tell me so—a heart inclined warmly to reciprocate friendly affection, to yield out reality or appearance in others, and to be un-

"Mr. Peck, spoken of by Mr. Gregory as a "very respectable man," drove the carriage. His name is omitted in the presentment. It became first known to the defense when mentioned in the testimony in court. Measures were immediately adopted for procuring his attendance. He had left the country, and the letter of Mr. Gregory arrived too late for any use of its contents on the trial.